

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE TWENTY NINETH DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE D.S.R.VARMA

WRIT PETITION NO : 9614 of 1995

Between:

1.M.Sreenivasulu S/o. Ganganna, H.No.10-2-3,

Uravakonda Village and Mandal, Ananthapur District.

2.Smt.Lalithamma W/o.Y.Hanumanna, H.No.8-1-4,

Uravakonda Village and Mandal, Ananthapur District.

..... PETITIONERS

AND

1.The Executive Engineer Panchayat Raj Department,
Ananthapur District.

2.The Deputy Executive Engineer Panchayat Raj Department,
Uravakonda, Ananthapur District.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a writ of mandamus declaring the action of the respondents in not providing the private water tap connection to the petitioners as illegal, arbitrary and consequently to direct the respondents to private water tap connection to the H.No.10-2-3 and H.No.8-1-4 of the petitioners 1 and 2 respectively of Uravakonda Village of Uravakonda Mandal Ananthapur District forthwith.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.M.R.K.CHOWDARY

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR PANCHAYAT RAJ & RURAL DEV

The Court made the following:

-

-

-

ORAL ORDER:

Heard both sides.

2. It appears that the only grievance of the petitioners in this writ petition was that water tap connections were not provided to their houses.

3. Initially, on 22-06-1995, this Court granted interim direction in W.P.M.P.No.11930 of 1995, directing the respondents to provide water tap connections to the petitioners' houses bearing Nos.10-2-3 and 8-1-4, Uravakonda Village and Mandal, Anantapur District respectively.

4. Subsequently, whether the said interim direction of this Court has been complied with or not is not known.

5. Having regard to the facts and circumstances, at this length of time, I do not think that anything survives for adjudication in this writ petition.

6. The writ petition fails and is liable to be dismissed as having become infructuous

7. In the result, the writ petition is dismissed as having become infructuous. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

29TH JULY 2004 D.S.R.VARMA, J

KRK

To:

- 1.The Executive Engineer Panchayat Raj Department,
Ananthapur District.
- 2.The Deputy Executive Engineer Panchayat Raj Department,
Uravakonda, Ananthapur District.
- 3.Two CCs to the Government Pleader for Panchayat Raj and Rural Development,
High Court Buildings, Hyderabad (OUT).
- 4.Two CD copies.
- 5.One spare.

